~ 05 - . 578

Cussex Correctional Institute Rt 113 Box 500 Georgetown, DE 19947

August 1, 2005

Re: Sofford v. State, No. 0410014004 Certionariand motion to dismiss

To whom it may concern:

In my haste to seek correction for these errors in Justice, I made the following ammissions. Please take note of this addendum and accept my apology.

Although in appearance it is quite proffestional, the letter from Sheryl Rush-Milstead, Esquire is a masterpiece of deception because it actually initigates a conflict instead of providing any resolution. The references to a stage-show or a theater-act are intended to demean a proposition of the correspondent, and actually describes the suggestion of inventing a script. She clearly avoids the issue, telling me only what I can not do, accusing me of intending to partificate before the Court. She offers no other solution, and makes no altempt to correct the presidice imposed by her appearant refusal to allow a statement during trial. There is no indication that she will do as she promises, which is evidenced because this is obviously an attempt to passify the client into submission, to accept the judgement of a public defender who offers no defense. Because no alternative other than the offer to ask incriminating questions is made, It is clear that I will not be allowed to make a statement, "or comment on anything, since that option is not given, and since she advises against giving testimony, my presence is really not even required.

(continued on reverse)

Page Iwo

Also politically correct, but legally unhelpful, the letter from Mr. Deeley, Mrs. Rush-Milsteads supervisor, suggests that I am morely being argumentative in order to disguise the transparency of an excuse for Counsel's unwillingness to provide assistance. The plurality of the word "letter" infact indicates that the phone number was freely given on more than one occasion to no avail. It is not likely that she was given an incorrect number, or that the phone company, who is in the business of providing phone numbers, would refuse her. The phone number in question is listed. In any case, is this a good reason to deny evidence which would go a long way to provide a little help? And why does Mr. Deeley, who is a State employee, believe that people with Jobs are robbers? Is medical information really needed to provide my defense?

Thank-you for your concern.

David C. Safford II,

SBI # 252614

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, David C. Saf	ford, hereby co	ertify that I have served a true an	ıd
correct copy of the attached	d Addendum to n	notion upon th	ne
following person/s below:			
NAME	STREET	<u>CITY/STATE/ZIP</u>	
Attorney General, Department of Justice, 102 W. Water St., Dover, DE 19901 Superior Court of Kent, Prothonotary, #38 The Green, Dover, DE 19901 Supreme Court of Delaware, Clerk, #55 The Green, Dover, DE 19901			
Supreme Court of Delas	Nare, Clerk, #55	The Green, Dover, DE 19901	_
			_

By placing same in a sealed, postage pre-paid envelope and depositing same in the United States Mail at Sussex Correctional Institution, P.O. Box 500, Georgetown, Delaware 19947.

This 2nd day of August, 2005.

D.C.SHOTE

(OVER)

David C. Safford, II

Defendant

V.

State of Delaware

Paintiff

\* No. 0410014004, below \*

## NOTICE

TO: Attorney General
Department of Justice
102 W. Water St.
Dover, DE 19901

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE of the attached addendum to the previously presented Certiorari / motion to dismiss in the matter of State v. Safford, No. 0410014004 in the Superior Court of Kent County, DE, which is to be presented before the honorable Court.

David C. Sofford IT SBI # 252614 Sussex Correctional Institute RA 113 Box 500 Georgetown, DE 19947

August 2, 2005

( WER)

I/M: 4 C. Schord # BLDG 9-201 SUSSEX CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION P.O. BOX 500 GEORGETOWN, DELAWARE 19947

1875 7965 7197

Lea Maintain the Charles of the Colonial of th

 $\phi_{4}$ 

1940143819